DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 915 UD 025 601

TITLE The Student Progress Plan, Grades One through Six, School Year 1985-86.
INSTITUTION District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, DC. Div. of Quality Assurance.
PUB DATE Dec 86
NOTE 58p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Curriculum Development; Elementary Education; Mathematics Instruction; *Minimum Competencies; *Program Effectiveness; Public Schools; Reading Instruction; Remedial Instruction; *Student Promotion; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Competency Based Curriculum; District of Columbia Public Schools

ABSTRACT

The District of Columbia's Student Progress Plan (SPP) was designed as the delivery system for the Competency-Based Curriculum (CBC), and regulates student promotions based on skill attainment and mastery of the instructional objectives. An evaluation of SPP was conducted in the second semester of school year 1985-86, and its findings are presented in this report. After an introduction and discussion of the scope of the report and data collection procedures, findings are presented on these topics: attainment of SPP objectives; impact of SPP on student promotion; student promotions in summer school; instructional processes under the competency-based curriculum; and strengths and weaknesses of SPP. A final section presents conclusions and recommendations. It is concluded that SPP is an effective delivery system for CBC. It continuously monitors and identifies deficient students and areas of weakness, and is very efficient in determining where remedial resources are needed. However, few remedial resources are utilized and there still remains the possibility of undeserved or "social" promotions. Two program changes are recommended: (1) mandative authority should be placed with SPP for remediation; and (2) the promotion process for the grade 6 students should be reviewed for the purpose of requiring additional documentation of skill mastery in reading and mathematics. Two appendices include forms used in evaluating reading and mathematics achievement and statistical tables. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 026 615

THE STUDENT PROGRESS PLAN
GRADES ONE THROUGH SIX
SCHOOL YEAR 1965-66

Dr. Florence Dukes McKenzie
Superintendent of Schools
Chief State School Officer

December 1966

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Cooper
D.C. Public Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

THE STUDENT PROGRESS PLAN
GRADES ONE THROUGH SIX
SCHOOL YEAR 1985-86

Division of Quality Assurance
and Management Planning

Mr. David L. Huie
Director

Dr. Norman Gold
Director
Research and Evaluation

Prepared by:

Dr. Kathy Tuck
Research Associate

Mr. Herman Cobb, Jr.
Director
Evaluation System

December 1986

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	3
Introduction to the Student Progress Plan (SPP)	11
Scope of this Report	12
Sampling and Data Collection	12
Objectives of SPP	13
Skill Mastery in Reading and Mathematics	13
Impact of SPP on Student Promotions	13
Rate of Promotion for All Students	13
Rate of Promotion for Boys and Girls	15
Rate of Promotion by Region and School	15
Rate of Promotions with Deficiencies	17
Rate of Promotion for Chapter 1 Students	19
Rate of Promotions for Chapter 1 Boys and Girls	20
Chapter 1 Promotions with Deficiencies	21
Rate of Chapter 1 Promotions by School	22
Student Promotions in Summer School	22
Instructional Processes Under the Competency-Based Curriculum (CBC)	25
Types of Reading and Math Programs	25
Stability of the Reading and Math Programs	28
Instructional Aids and Techniques	28
Remedial and Tutorial Support Services	31
Chapter 1 Program in Reading and Mathematics	34
Strengths and Weaknesses of SPP	34
Strengths of SPP	34
Weaknesses of SPP	35
Conclusions and Recommendations	36
References	37
Appendixes	
A. Forms #300 and #301	38
B. Tables A - K	42

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AN EVALUATION OF THE STUDENT PROGRESS PLAN
School Year 1985-86

The Student Progress Plan (SPP) was designed as the delivery system for the Competency-Based Curriculum, and in this regard regulates student promotions based on skill attainment and mastery of the instructional objectives (DCPS, 1981). An evaluation of SPP was conducted by the Division of Quality Assurance for the second semester of school year 1985-86. Several findings were unveiled with regard to student promotions in D.C. Public Schools, and certain factors were highlighted which appeared to be paramount in their relationship to skill mastery and student promotion rates.

STUDENT PROMOTIONS UNDER SPP

The second semester promotion rate was found to be 92.8%. Although this present overall rate is slightly lower than that of the previous school year (.2% lower), the student promotion rate has increased annually since it was fully implemented in SY 1981-82. In fact, a longitudinal examination of all grade cohorts shows a consistent increase in their rates of promotion with each successive grade and year (see attachments, Table A).

However, while student promotions appear to be increasing, the number of promotions with deficiencies also appear to be increasing. SPP monitors skill attainment and allows students with deficiencies in either reading or math (but not both) to be promoted in "transition". To this end, SPP was designed to identify areas of student weakness early on for remediation while allowing such students to continue progressing. Although the total number of student promotions with deficiencies has declined slightly over the past few years (down 3% since SY 82-83), the present examination has found an increase in the number of students promoted with deficiencies with each successive grade level (see attachments, Table B). This finding is evidence of a cumulative effect and suggests that student deficiencies in reading and math are being carried forth rather than effectively remediated as intended.

Also, a substantial decline was found in the number of student promotions with deficiencies at the sixth grade level (see also Table B). Since the sixth grade had the highest rate of promotion overall, this evaluation questions how such deficiencies, which appear to be accumulating with each grade level, are remediated to this extent within the sixth grade year. Since these students were seeking promotions out of their particular schools, it is posited that many of these students were assessed more leniently on skill attainment than the other students participating in SPP, and were therefore, "socially promoted". This position is taken particularly in view of recent findings that upon entry into junior high school under the Secondary Student Progress Plan 29% of the seventh grade students failed one to four courses, and more than one-half (63%) had achievement scores below the national norm (CTBS total battery) (DCPS, 1985). It was also found that a number of schools had promotion rates above 90% although their sixth grade CTBS scores were below the national norm in both reading and math.

FACTORS RELATED TO SKILL MASTERY AND STUDENT PROMOTIONS UNDER SPP

In addition to examining the results of SPP, several factors were also examined in their relationship to skill mastery under SPP. Two factors which appeared to be highly relevant to skill mastery were remedial and tutorial support services and school attendance.

REMEDIAL AND TUTORIAL SUPPORT SERVICES

It was found that approximately one-half of all students received help through the remedial services available from the reading and math specialists and teacher aides (see attachments, Table C). However, only 25% of the students had received extra help from each of the other tutorial support services.

Further, it was found that the majority of those students showing skill mastery had received extra help regularly. In fact, 73.8% of those students showing skill mastery in reading and 75.1% of those students showing skill mastery in math received extra help five days a week. Yet, only 28.0% of those failing to show skill mastery in reading and 22.9% of those failing to show skill mastery in math received remedial and tutorial support this frequently. It, therefore, appears that a substantial number of those students showing skill mastery levels under SPP required and received remedial services on a daily basis, and the majority of those students not receiving remedial support this frequently did not show skill mastery.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

School attendance was also found to be highly related to skill mastery under SPP. While only 10% of all students participating in SPP were found to have excessive absences (20 or more school days) the majority of those students with excessive absences were found to lack skill mastery in reading (95.9%) and math (95.8%). Based on this and other information, it was found that more than one-half (53%) of those students promoted with deficiencies were students with an excessive number of school absences. This finding clearly indicates that the attainment of skill mastery under SPP is highly associated with school attendance.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these and other findings, it is concluded that SPP is a very effective promotional system for delivering CBC but requires support on several facets in order to successfully achieve its intended goals.

In order for SPP to adequately identify student deficiencies at all grade levels and assure that students are not promoted until they have reached the required objectives in reading and math, particularly at the sixth grade level, students must be assessed justly but with less leniency. To accomplish this, additional measures appear to be necessary in documenting the attainment of the instructional objectives. It is recommended that, in addition to using the checklist of objectives, a competency test be administered to sixth grade students to assess their academic readiness for junior high school.

In order for SPP to foster continuous and significant student progress, student deficiencies must not only be identified but remediated as soon as possible. To accomplish this, increased remedial and tutorial support services appear to be required. Moreover, while school attendance is necessary in order for students to receive both regular instruction and required support services, it is critical for those students having difficulty.

REFERENCES

District of Columbia Public Schools, Division of Quality Assurance. (October, 1981). The Student Progress Plan (SPP) Implementation: Grades One-Three. Washington, D.C.

District of Columbia Public Schools, Division of Quality Assurance. (June, 1985). Student Progress Plan (SPP) Grades One-Six and Secondary School Progress Plan (SSPP) Grade Seven Promotion Results. Washington, D.C.

ATTACHMENTS

Tables A - C

TABLE A

SPP Promotions for Second Semester
Since Implementation

Grade Level	School Year 1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86
1	86.5	81.9	85.9	87.4	87.1	87.3
2	85.1	82.8	90.7	91.7	91.8	91.6
3	79.2	82.7	91.9	93.3	92.8	92.6
4	n/a	81.4	92.9	94.2	94.2	94.6
5	n/a	70.2	91.9	94.5	95.6	95.4
6	n/a	85.2	96.5	96.8	98.0	97.2
1-6	83.6	80.7	81.5	92.8	93.0	92.8

TABLE B

Students Promoted with Deficiencies

(Second Semester - SY 1985-86)

Grade	Total Students	Promoted with Deficiencies		Percent of Deficiency Attributed to:	
		number	percent	reading	math
1	7101	766	10.8	80.3	19.7
2	6335	1231	19.4	71.4	28.4
3	6187	1385	22.4	61.0	39.0
4	5627	1398	24.8	50.3	49.7
5	5359	1484	27.7	50.2	49.8
6	5173	155	3.0	41.9	58.1
1-6	35782	6419	17.9	60.0	40.0

TABLE C

Students Receiving Remedial and Tutorial Support Services

Source of Support	Reading number	Reading percent	Math number	Math percent
specialist	9837	(26)	10140	(27)
teacher aide	8604	(23)	8515	(22)
peer tutor	2976	(8)	3358	(9)
jr/sr high tutor	298	(1)	351	(1)
college tutor	295	(1)	283	(1)
parent/community tutor	2050	(5)	1945	(5)
Operation Rescue	224	(1)	290	(1)
other	1134	(3)	1006	(3)
Operation Rescue After School	109	(1)	122	(1)
STARS (Chapter 1)	1764	(5)	1740	(5)

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDENT PROGRESS PLAN (SPP)

The Student Progress Plan (SPP) is a continuous progress plan used to deliver the Competency-Based Curriculum (CBC) in D.C. Public Schools (DCPS). CBC, which was introduced in 1976 and fully implemented by September 1979, "was designed to help children succeed through a skills mastery instructional program which takes into account individual differences in learning styles and rates of growth (DCPS, 1981).

SPP was implemented in 1980 (grades one-three) and 1981 (grades four-six) and was designed to ensure that students achieve satisfactory levels of competence before promotion to a higher grade level. SPP is an individual progress plan whereby skill attainment is assessed objectively and allows deficiencies to be identified and remediated early on.

Under the SPP, promotion occurs at the end of each semester as opposed to once at the end of the school year. Each grade level is divided into Part-A (first semester) and Part-B (second semester). For example, the first grade is divided into levels 1A and 1B. In order for a student to be promoted from 1A to 1B, he or she must master at least 70% of the curriculum objectives in both reading and math for the semester. Further, the 70% mastery must include all of the "critical" objectives of the curriculum. If however, a student shows skill mastery in one instructional area and not the other, the student is promoted to the next grade level but is classified as a student with a deficiency and in "transition". Such transitional status is indicated by the letter "T" attached to the new grade level (i.e. from 1A to 1BT). In the case where a student fails to master (70%) of the objectives in both reading and math, the student is then retained for another semester. For further explanation see "The student progress plan (SPP) implementation: grades one-three" (DCPS, 1981)

CBC provides that students in transition be given remediation in the areas of their weakness in order to meet instructional objectives and maintain sufficient progress through each instructional level. To this end, students in transition attain promotions at varying rates and have, therefore, created a substantial amount of heterogeneity in classroom compositions.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

Since the implementation SPP in September 1980, a report has been issued at the end of each semester assessing the impact of SPP on elementary student progress. Each of these reports have provided statistics with regard to promotions, retentions, deficiencies, remediation and other student information. This report will provide similar information but will further address such data as it appears relevant to specific issues of SPP effectiveness and outcomes. These issues are of particular interest at this time because all grade levels currently participating in SPP have participated since their entry into DCPS; the sixth grade students began participation during their first grade in SY 1980-1981. Therefore, this evaluation of SPP and its impact at each grade level will describe the continuous and long-term effects of SPP across the elementary school span.

This report addresses SPP for SY 1985-1986 with emphasis on second semester promotions. There will be a discussion on the SPP objectives and skill mastery in reading and math, the impact of SPP on student progress, the instructional processes used under CBC to meet the SPP objectives, the strengths and weaknesses of SPP as determined by particular components of the plan, as well as conclusions and recommendations which might be used in future curriculum planning.

Sampling and Data Collection

The data for this report was obtained from 1532 teachers of grades one through six. The teachers completed a single Form #300 describing their instructional practices and a Form #301 for each of their students (see Appendix A). The student Form #301 provided information on skill mastery levels, deficiencies, remediation, and other characteristics of 35,782 regular and chapter one students. Information was also obtained for special education students who were mainstreamed and participated in reading and math to the same extent as regular students.

Due to the heterogeneity of grade levels found in the classrooms, analysis of the teacher Form #300 by grade level required that teachers be assigned the grade level for which the majority of their students were assigned. Since this was a manual and time-consuming task, a random selection procedure was used to limit the number of teachers included. Two-hundred three (203) teachers from sixteen (16) randomly selected schools (two schools from each ward), were manually assigned their predominate grade level for special analyses. This selection procedure eliminated

the process of manually assigning all teachers (1532) a predominant grade level, but yet provides information which can be generalized to all teachers participating.

OBJECTIVES OF SPP

SPP is a skills mastery plan developed to ensure that all DCPS students attain a "mastery" level of reading and math before promotion to the next highest instructional level. A mastery level is obtained when the student demonstrates competency in at least 70% of the instructional objectives indicated on the reading or math checklist, including all critical objectives. In addition, SPP was developed as an administrative process which systematically identifies deficiencies in reading and math early in the school years in order that these students receive appropriate remedial services in the area of weakness. SPP then permits such services to be evaluated through an assessment of student skill mastery levels.

Skill Mastery in Reading and Mathematics

The primary objective of SPP is the attainment of a mastery level in the basic skills of reading and math for all students before promotion to the next highest instructional level. For this second semester, 82.2% of the students showed a mastery level in reading and 82.5% showed a mastery level in math.

To assure such mastery levels, the Division of Quality Assurance monitors: (1) the reading and math material currently being used in grades one through six; (2) the stability of the reading and math programs in the classroom; (3) the instructional aids used by the teachers in the reading and math programs; and (4) the type and amount of remediation provided to students demonstrating a need in reading and math. A description of these components and supporting data is presented later on in this report.

IMPACT OF SPP ON STUDENT PROMOTIONS

Rate of Promotion for All Students

For the second semester, SY 1985-86, promotion data for 35,782 students were reported. This was 93.5% of the student membership reported in March 1986 for grades one through six. As shown in Table 1a., 92.8% of these students were promoted and 7.2% were retained.

SPP was founded on the assumption that if deficiencies are identified and remediated early, students will make satisfactory progress in school and will be evidenced by their successive rates of promotion. As further shown in Table 1a., a higher rate of promotion is recorded for each successive grade level.

TABLE 1a.
SPP Promotion Rates
(Second Semester)

Grade	Total Students	Students Promoted		Students Retained	
		number	percent	number	percent
1	7101	6201	87.33	900	12.67
2	6335	5805	91.63	530	8.37
3	6187	5729	92.60	458	7.40
4	5627	5324	94.62	303	5.38
5	5359	5114	95.43	245	4.57
6	5173	5033	97.29	140	2.71
1-6	35782	33206	92.80	2576	7.20

As indicated in Table 1b., a longitudinal examination of all grade cohorts, who have participated in SPP since their entrance into DCPS, found an increase in nearly all rates of promotion for each ending school year. This finding lends further support to the assumption that early detection and remediation of deficiencies will facilitate the rate of student progress and promotion.

TABLE 1b.
SPP Promotions for Second Semester
Since Implementation

Grade Level	School Year					
	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86
1	86.5	81.9	85.9	87.4	87.1	87.3
2	85.1	82.8	90.7	91.7	91.8	91.6
3	79.2	82.7	91.9	93.3	92.8	92.6
4	n/a	81.4	92.9	94.2	94.2	94.6
5	n/a	70.2	91.9	94.5	95.6	95.4
6	n/a	85.2	96.5	96.8	98.0	97.2
1-6	83.6	80.7	91.5	92.8	93.0	92.8

Also, as indicated in Table 1b., the current promotion rate of 92.8% for all students shows a slight decline from the previous second semester of SY 1984-85 (93.0%). However, this is a

substantial increase over the rate of promotion recorded in SY 1981-82 (72.7%) when SPP began full implementation.

Rate of Promotion for Boys and Girls

Historically, the rate of promotion under SPP has been higher for girls than boys. A similar pattern was noted for this semester, and as shown in Table 2, the rate of promotion for the girls exceeded that of the boys at each grade level. The greatest difference between the boys and girls was noted for the first grade level, and the least difference was found at the sixth grade level. Further examination also revealed that, overall, slightly more girls than boys had mastered reading and math (51.1% vs. 48.2% respectively in reading; 50.6% vs. 48.6% respectively in math). This finding is consistent with the literature in that girls have the higher achievement levels than boys in the early years.

TABLE 2
SPP Promotions for Boys and Girls
(Second Semester)

Grade	Boys		Girls	
	number	percent	number	percent
1	3630	84.19	3416	90.57
2	3226	89.15	3068	94.20
3	3084	90.34	3074	94.93
4	2699	92.55	2875	96.49
5	2701	93.37	2619	97.59
6	2505	96.61	2629	98.02
1-6	17845	90.55	17681	95.07

Note: Those students not identified by sex have been excluded.

Rate of Promotion by Region and School

As shown in Table 3., the highest rate of promotion was found in Region B (95.4%), with both Regions B and D showing promotion rates above the systemwide rate of 92.8%.

TABLE 3
SPP Promotions by Region
(Second Semester)

Grade	Region A	Region B	Region C	Region D	Systemwide
1	85.09	91.57	87.50	87.32	87.33
2	90.61	95.16	90.25	92.00	91.63
3	90.32	94.09	92.38	94.15	92.60
4	94.39	96.99	93.14	94.58	94.62
5	94.95	97.11	94.00	95.98	95.43
6	98.12	99.39	93.72	97.99	97.29
1-6	91.78	95.46	91.57	93.33	92.80
Total Students	11192	5775	7865	10940	35772

Note: Those students (10) not identified by region have been excluded.

** Region A

Promotion data was reported for 31 schools and 11,192 students (see Appendix B, Table A).

Promotion rates by school ranged from a low of 84.9% to a high of 97.9%, and 11 schools had promotion rates above the systemwide rate.

** Region B

Promotion data was reported for 25 schools and 5,775 students (see Appendix B, Table B).

Promotion rates by school ranged from a low of 91.1% to a high of 100% in one school, and 19 schools had promotion rates above the systemwide rate.

** Region C

Promotion data was reported for 27 schools and 7,865 students (see Appendix B, Table C).

Promotion rates by school ranged from a low of 84.7% to a high of 100% in one school, and 12 schools had promotion rates above the systemwide rate.

** Region D

Promotion data was reported for 41 schools and 10,940 students (see Appendix B, Table D).

Promotion rates by school ranged from a low of 85.0% to a high of 100% in one school, and 24 schools had promotion rates above the systemwide rate.

Also, as shown in Appendix B, Table E, Regions A and C had a decline in promotion rates from the previous year and fell slightly under the systemwide rate.

Rate of Promotions with Deficiencies

As earlier indicated, a student showing skill mastery in either reading or math, but not both, will be promoted as a student in "transition". In this regard, 17.9% of the students promoted during this semester were promoted with deficiencies in either reading or math (see Table 4a.). It was found that the percent of deficiencies attributed to reading decreased with grade level while the percent of deficiencies attributed to math increased with grade level. A comparison with promotion rates for previous years indicated that the number of promotions with deficiencies, overall, have decreased by 3.3% over the past three school years (SY 82-83 had 21.2% promotions with deficiencies).

TABLE 4a
Students Promoted with Deficiencies
(Second Semester)

Grade	Total Students	Promoted with Deficiencies		Percent of Deficiency Attributed to:	
		number	percent	reading	math
1	7101	766	10.8	80.3	19.7
2	6335	1231	19.4	71.6	28.4
3	6187	1385	22.4	61.0	39.0
4	5627	1398	24.8	50.3	49.7
5	5359	1484	27.7	50.2	49.8
6	5173	155	3.0	41.9	58.1
1-6	35782	6419	17.9	60.0	40.0

It was also found that the number of students promoted with deficiencies increased with grade level up through the fifth grade. At the sixth grade level the number of students promoted with deficiencies was drastically reduced (see Table 4a.). In comparison to grades one through five, the sharp decline in the number of deficient students at the sixth grade level raised a concern in this evaluation, particularly since the sixth grade students had not received more remedial services than the other students (see Appendix B, Table F).

Although all students were not identified by sex, more boys were reportedly promoted with deficiencies than girls; 20.2% of the students identified as boys were promoted with deficiencies and 15.8% of the students identified as girls were promoted with deficiencies (see Tables 4b. and 4c.). Overall, both boys and girls appeared to be more deficient in reading than math.

TABLE 4b.
Boys Promoted with Deficiencies
(Second Semester)

Grade	Total Students	Promoted with Deficiencies		Percent of Deficiency Attributed to:	
		number	percent	reading	math
1	3630	455	12.5	83.7	16.3
2	3226	719	22.3	75.1	24.9
3	3084	819	26.6	67.6	32.4
4	2699	737	27.3	58.6	41.4
5	2701	790	29.2	56.2	43.5
6	2505	89	3.6	43.8	56.2
1-6	17845	3609	20.2	66.3	33.7

Note: Those students not identified by sex have been excluded.

TABLE 4c.
Girls Promoted with Deficiencies
(Second Semester)

Grade	Total Students	Promoted with Deficiencies		Percent of Deficiency Attributed to:	
		number	percent	reading	math
1	3416	303	8.9	74.6	25.4
2	3068	503	16.4	66.4	33.6
3	3074	595	19.4	54.3	45.7
4	2875	649	22.6	41.4	58.6
5	2619	679	25.9	42.9	57.1
6	2629	63	2.4	38.1	61.9
1-6	17681	2792	15.8	52.5	47.5

Note: Those students not identified by sex have been excluded.

Rate of Promotion of Chapter 1 Students

Since Chapter 1 students are considered to be a "special needs" group, it is of interest to this evaluation to make a special note of the impact SPP has on the progress of these students. Data was obtained for 10,476 Chapter 1 students (29.3% of the total student data). It was reported that 10,082 students had received Chapter 1 services in reading and 9,434 students had received Chapter 1 services in math.

As shown in Table 5a., the second semester promotion rate for Chapter 1 students was 89.2% and lower than the systemwide rate of 92.8%. The Chapter 1 student promotion rate was similar to the systemwide rate in that it increased with grade level. Upon examination of Chapter 1 promotion rates for previous school years, however, it is found that promotions have not increased steadily. In four out of six grade levels, the current promotion rate for Chapter 1 students is lower than that for the previous ending school year (see Appendix B, Table G).

TABLE 5a
SPP Promotions for Chapter 1 Students
(Second Semester)

Grade	Total Students	Promoted		Retained	
		number	percent	number	percent
1	2225	1821	81.84	404	18.16
2	1797	1546	86.03	251	13.97
3	1747	1570	89.87	177	10.13
4	1472	1339	90.96	133	9.04
5	1787	1679	93.96	108	6.04
6	1448	1398	96.55	50	3.45
1-6	10476	9353	89.28	1123	10.72

Rate of Promotion for Chapter 1 Boys and Girls

Fifty-three percent of the students receiving Chapter 1 services were identified as boys and 46.5% were identified as girls. As shown in Table 5b., 86.8% of the boys receiving Chapter 1 services were promoted, and 92.0% of the girls were promoted.

TABLE 5b
SPP Promotions for Chapter 1 Boys and Girls
(Second Semester)

Grade	Boys		Girls	
	reported	% promoted	reported	% promoted
1	1236	79.05	985	85.28
2	944	83.04	798	89.35
3	922	87.74	821	92.45
4	742	89.22	725	92.69
5	939	91.59	843	96.56
6	738	94.96	704	98.15
1-6	5571	86.84	4876	92.06

Chapter 1 Promotions with Deficiencies

As shown in Table 5c., 28% of the Chapter 1 students were promoted with deficiencies in either reading or math. Similar to the total student data, the number of Chapter 1 students promoted with deficiencies increased with grade level. Also, more students were promoted with deficiencies in reading than math for all grades except sixth.

TABLE 5c.
SPP Promotions of Chapter 1 Students with Deficiencies
(Second Semester)

Grade	Total Students	Promoted with Deficiencies		Percent of Deficiency Attributed to:	
		number	percent	reading	math
1	2225	365	16.4	87.1	12.9
2	1797	449	25.0	73.1	26.9
3	1747	565	32.3	65.1	34.9
4	1472	647	44.0	55.6	44.4
5	1787	829	46.4	51.6	48.4
6	1448	81	5.6	34.6	65.4
1-6	10476	2936	28.0	62.3	37.7

As further shown in Tables 5d and 5e, slightly more boys than girls were promoted with deficiencies. Both boys and girls appeared to have more deficiencies in reading than math. Also, it was noted for both boys and girls that the percent of deficiencies attributed to reading decreased with grade level while the percent of deficiencies attributed to math increased with grade level.

TABLE 5d.
SPP Promotions for Chapter 1 Boys with Deficiencies
(Second Semester)

Grade	Total Students	Promoted with Deficiencies		Percent of Deficiency Attributed to:	
		number	percent	reading	math
1	1236	221	17.9	87.8	12.2
2	994	265	26.7	73.2	26.8
3	992	338	36.7	73.1	26.9
4	742	338	45.6	65.7	34.3
5	939	440	46.9	58.0	42.0
6	738	44	6.0	40.9	59.1
1-6	5571	1646	29.5	68.7	31.3

TABLE 5e.
SPP Promotions for Chapter 1 Girls with Deficiencies
(Second Semester)

Grade	Total Students	Promoted with Deficiencies		Percent of Deficiency Attributed to:	
		number	percent	reading	math
1	985	150	15.2	81.3	18.7
2	798	184	23.1	72.8	27.2
3	821	252	30.7	57.9	42.1
4	725	303	41.8	45.5	54.5
5	843	386	45.8	44.0	56.0
6	7304	483	5.4	23.7	76.3
1-6	4876	1313	26.9	54.8	45.2

Rate of Chapter 1 Promotions by School

Student promotion data was reported for 72 Chapter 1 schools. As shown in Appendix B, Tables G-J, promotion rates ranged from a low of 77.6% (Region C) to a high of 100% in one school (Region C). Thirty-eight schools had promotion rates above the overall Chapter 1 promotion rate of 89.2%, and 19 schools had promotion rates above the systemwide promotion rate of 92.8%.

STUDENT PROMOTIONS IN SUMMER SCHOOL

Promotion data was also obtained for 3,414 students attending school (June - August 1986). For those students identified by sex, 60.5% (n=2066) were boys and 38.6% (n=1319) were girls. Twenty-nine students were not identified by sex.

As shown in Table 6a, 86% of these students were promoted and 13.3% were retained. As further shown in Table 6B, 84.5% of the boys attending summer school were promoted, and 90.1% of the girls were promoted.

TABLE 6a.
SPP Promotions for Summer School

Grade	Total Students	Students Promoted		Student Retained	
		number	percent	number	percent
1	597	457	76.6	140	23.4
2	582	495	85.0	87	15.0
3	632	514	81.3	118	18.7
4	564	511	90.6	53	9.4
5	548	513	93.6	35	6.4
6	491	471	95.9	20	4.1
1-6	3414	2961	86.7	453	13.3

TABLE 6b.

Summer School Promotions for Boys and Girls

Grade	Boys		Girls	
	reported	% promoted	reported	% promoted
1	381	73.8	214	81.3
2	372	83.3	206	87.9
3	391	78.5	235	85.5
4	324	87.9	239	94.1
5	325	91.7	217	96.3
6	273	97.1	208	95.1
1-6	2066	84.5	1319	90.1

Approximately one-half (47.7%) of the students promoted had deficiencies in either reading or math. As shown in Table 7a, the number of promotions with deficiencies increased with grade level up to the sixth grade; similar to the end of year promotions, the number of sixth grade summer school promotions with deficiencies was substantially lower than at the other grade levels. Also, it was found that reading deficiencies decreased with grade level while math deficiencies increased with grade level.

TABLE 7a.
Summer School Promotions with Deficiencies

Grade	Total Students	Promoted with Deficiencies		Percent of Deficiency Attributed to:	
		number	percent	reading	math
1	597	214	35.8	80.8	19.2
2	582	288	49.5	71.2	28.8
3	632	363	57.4	58.7	41.3
4	548	367	67.0	41.7	58.3
5	843	386	45.8	44.0	56.0
6	491	43	8.8	32.6	67.4
1-6	3414	1629	47.7	56.2	43.8

As further shown in Tables 7b and 7c, 46.9% of the boys attending summer school were promoted with deficiencies, while 49.1% of the girls were promoted with deficiencies. It was found that the boys had substantially more deficits in reading than math, while the girls showed greater deficits in math than reading.

TABLE 7b.
Summer School Promotions for Boys with Deficiencies

Grade	Total Students	Promoted with Deficiencies		Percent of Deficiency Attributed to:	
		number	percent	reading	math
1	381	138	36.2	77.5	22.5
2	372	173	46.5	76.9	23.1
3	391	225	57.5	66.7	33.3
4	324	194	59.9	53.1	41.9
5	325	214	65.8	48.1	51.9
6	273	24	8.8	37.5	62.5
1-6	2066	968	46.9	62.5	37.5

TABLE 7c.
Summer School Promotions for Girls with Deficiencies

Grade	Total Students	Promoted with Deficiencies		Percent of Deficiency Attributed to:	
		number	percent	reading	math
1	214	74	34.6	86.5	13.5
2	206	113	54.9	62.8	37.2
3	235	134	57.0	45.5	54.5
4	239	160	66.9	34.4	65.6
5	217	149	68.7	32.2	67.8
6	208	18	8.7	27.8	72.2
1-6	1319	648	49.1	46.9	53.1

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESSES UNDER THE COMPETENCY-BASED CURRICULUM (CBC)

Types of Reading and Math Programs

Reading:

In SY 1981-1982 the reading textbook list was reduced to ten recommended textbooks. The approval of this list was based on correlations found with CBC objectives, as well as student achievement (DCPS, 1984). Although the teachers could continue using other material which was still on hand, new purchases were authorized only from the approved list. The list included books published by: Allyn and Bacon, American Book Company, Ginn, Harcourt Brace, Harper and Row, Holt, Houghton Mifflin, Lippincott, MacMillan, and Scott Foresman.

Now, four years since the adoption of the reading textbook list, 82% of the students participating in SPP are using these books in their reading programs (see Table 8A). As shown in Table 8A, the most frequently used text from the approved list was MacMillian, and the least frequently used was Harper and Row. In addition to the approved list, a substantial number of students were reported to also have used Goodyear (Success in Reading and Writing), a "variety of published materials", and the DCPS curriculum guide only.

TABLE 8a.
Most Frequently Used Reading Textbooks

Book Publisher	Total Students		Mastery in Reading (percent)	Non-Mastery in Reading (percent)
	number	percent		
* MacMillan	8446	21.2	86.2	13.8
* Ginn	6421	16.1	86.6	13.4
* Lippincott	4165	10.5	86.2	13.8
* Harcourt Brace & Jovanovich	3925	9.9	88.6	11.4
* Scott, Foresman	2308	5.8	87.3	12.7
* Houghton Mifflin	2198	5.5	89.6	10.4
* American Book Company	2136	5.4	86.0	14.0
* Holt, Rhinehart and Winston	2077	5.2	85.7	14.3
Goodyear(success in reading & writing)	982	2.5	89.3	10.7
Variety of Published materials	780	2.0	76.3	23.7
* Allyn & Bacon	676	1.7	91.6	8.4
DISTAR/Reading Mastery	452	1.1	89.2	10.8
Curriculum Guide Only	369	0.9	88.6	11.4
Newspaper & Magazines	249	0.6	87.1	12.9
* Harper & Row	224	0.6	93.8	6.3
Teacher Made Materials	140	0.4	35.7	64.3
Phonetic Keys	107	0.3	84.1	15.9
Science Research Associates (SRA)	68	0.2	95.6	4.4
Reader's Digest Service	48	0.1	89.6	10.4
WEISS	42	0.1	90.5	9.5
Merrill Linguistic	37	0.1	78.4	21.9
D.C. Reading Comprehension Skills Exercises	36	0.1	83.3	16.7
Open Court	32	0.1	84.4	15.6
Laidlaw Brothers	25	0.1	84.0	16.0
Other Textbook Series	279	0.7	82.4	17.6

*Textbooks approved in SY 81-82 for continued use and purchase

Upon examining the reading material by mastery or non-mastery of the reading objectives, it was found that at least 85% of all students using the reading material from the recommended list had reportedly mastered the reading objectives at their instructional level.

Math:

As shown in Table 8b, more than one-half (56.4%) of the students were reported to be using material primarily from three publishers: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston; Houghton Mifflin; and MacMillian. It was further reported that at least 87% of the students using these math materials showed skill mastery levels.

TABLE 8b.
Most Frequently Used Math Textbooks

Book Publisher	Total Students		Mastery in Reading	Non-Mastery in Reading
	number	percent	percent	percent
Holt, Rhinehart & Winston	10043	25.2	87.2	12.8
MacMillan	8402	21.1	87.1	12.9
Houghton Mifflin	4022	10.1	89.5	10.5
Harcourt Brace & Jovanovich	3534	8.9	86.8	13.2
Harper and Row	2097	5.3	86.3	13.7
Addison Wesley	1867	4.7	86.9	13.1
DCPS Curriculum Guide	1021	2.6	83.3	16.7
DC Health	997	2.5	88.1	11.9
Open Court	986	2.5	85.4	14.6
Webster Division, McGraw-Hill	852	2.1	86.7	13.3
*Open Court	716	1.8	----	----
Variety of Software	519	1.3	79.4	20.6
Silver Burdett	465	1.2	90.3	9.7
Scott, Foresman	343	0.9	85.7	14.3
Laidlaw Brothers	322	0.8	88.2	11.8
Random House	172	0.4	74.4	25.6
American Book Company	118	0.3	89.8	10.2
Science Research Associates (SRA)	70	0.2	97.1	2.9
Charles E. Merrill	46	0.1	91.3	8.7
Cambridge Book Company	31	0.1	93.5	6.5
Other Textbooks	692	2.5	85.4	14.6

*Open Court was pilot tested in five schools and appeared as a "write-in" response on the Student Form 301. The percentage of students showing skill mastery and non-mastery are included in the "Other Textbooks" category.

Stability of the Reading and Math Programs

Reading:

To further ensure that elementary students attain a mastery level of reading, the stability of the reading program is monitored through CBC. The similarity of the reading material throughout the school year, whether the homeroom or family teacher is also the student's reading teacher, the length of time the student has been in a particular homeroom class, and whether the students are involved in a reading activity at least once a day are all considered to be factors of stability in a reading program.

With regard to the similarity of the reading materials, 70% of the students were reported to use reading material which was very similar all year, and less than 3% were reported to have used somewhat similar material all year. For the remaining students (27%), the teachers either reported that the reading material was not similar, that they did not know if the material was similar, or reported no response at all.

Also, it was reported that 90% of the students had their homeroom teachers as reading teachers; 80% had been in the same homerooms for the entire nine month school year, and 99.9% of the teachers reported that their students were involved in a reading activity everyday.

Math:

As with reading, CBC monitors particular aspects of the elementary math programs as factors of stability. The teachers reported that 68% of all students were using math material "very similar" to the material used all year, and 4% were reported to be using "somewhat similar material".

Also, 91% of the students were reported to have their homeroom teachers as their math teacher, and 99.5% of all teachers reported that their students were involved in a math activity everyday.

Instructional Aids and Techniques

Reading:

To assist the teachers with their instructions in reading, several aids are required for use under CBC. The majority of all teachers reported that they used objectives, instructional activities, assessment tasks, checklists, manuals, progress sheets and cluster tests (see Table 9a). However, less than 80% reported using learning stations.

Table 9a.
30ercentages of Teachers using
CBC Instructional Aids in Reading

Instructional Aids	Grade					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Objectives	96.6	96.9	100	100	97.3	97.7
Instructional Activities	89.7	93.8	90.0	100	94.6	90.7
Assessment Tasks	93.1	96.9	93.3	96.9	100	88.4
Checklists	93.1	93.8	93.3	93.8	100	93.0
Grades/Manuals	93.1	93.8	86.7	96.9	97.3	90.7
Progress Sheets/ Charts	82.8	84.4	76.7	84.4	81.1	81.4
Learning Stations	55.2	75.0	50.0	65.6	73.0	65.1
Survey Cluster Tests	89.7	84.4	86.7	87.5	89.2	76.7

Note: The data used for this analysis by grade level was from a sub-sample of teachers at 16 randomly selected schools.

Math:

The majority of the teachers reported that they used CBC objectives, instructional activities, assessment tasks, checklists, manuals and cluster tests instructional aids in mathematics (see Table 9b). Progress sheets and learning stations were used less frequently.

Table 9b.
Percentage of Teachers using
CBC Instructional Aids in Math

Instructional Aids	Grade					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Objectives	96.6	96.9	96.7	96.9	97.3	97.7
Instructional Activities	89.7	93.8	86.7	96.9	94.6	90.7
Assessment Tasks	93.1	96.9	96.7	93.8	100	88.4
Checklists	93.1	93.8	93.3	90.6	100	93.0
Guides/Manuals	89.7	93.8	90.0	90.6	97.3	88.4
Progress Sheets/ Charts	82.8	84.4	73.3	84.4	81.1	81.4
Learning Stations	51.7	78.1	63.3	68.8	67.6	62.8
Survey Cluster Tests	89.7	84.4	93.3	87.5	91.9	79.1

Note: The data used for this analysis by grade level was from a sub-sample of teachers at 16 randomly selected schools.

The teachers also indicated the order in which they used certain math instructional techniques. Analyses by grade indicated that the majority of the teachers for all grade levels used manipulative materials first, followed by the use of pictorial materials (see Table 9c).

Table 9c.
Instructional Techniques used in Math in Ranked Order

Instructional Aids	Grade					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Use of Abstract Material/Blackboard	4	4	3	3&4	3	3
Use of pictorial Material Blackboard	2	2	1&2	2	2	2
Use of Manipulative Material	1	1	4	1	1	1
Lecture/Explaining	3	3	4	1	4	4

Remedial and Tutorial Support Services

Reading:

To further assist teachers, the reading instructional programs call for the provision of extra help to students from a variety of sources during the regular school day as well as after school. As shown in Table 10a, a substantial number of students received extra help in reading from the remedial services available. The teachers reported that 26% of their students received help from a reading specialist or resource teacher, and 23% received help from a teacher aide. However, few students were reported to have received extra help from the other tutorial sources (e.g. peer tutors, parent or community tutors, junior and senior high school tutors, college tutors, and tutorial programs such as Chapter 1 STARS and the Operation Rescue).

TABLE 10a.
Students Receiving Extra Help in Reading and Math

Source of Extra Help	Reading		Math	
	number	percent	number	percent
Specialist	9837	(26)	10140	(27)
Teacher-Aide	8604	(23)	8515	(22)
Peer Tutor	2976	(8)	3358	(9)
Junior/Senior High Tutor	298	(1)	351	(1)
College Tutor	295	(1)	283	(1)
Parent/Community	2050	(5)	1945	(5)
Operation Rescue	224	(1)	290	(1)
Other	1134	(3)	1006	(3)
Operation Rescue After School	109	(0)	122	(0)
STARS (Chapter)	1764	(5)	1740	(5)
Total Percent		(73)		(74)

It was also reported that 73.8% of those students showing mastery in reading had received extra help 5 days a week, while only 28.0% of those students not showing a mastery level in reading had received extra help this often (see Table 10b). It, therefore, appears that tutorial services in reading are highly related to skill mastery when rendered frequently.

TABLE 10b.
Percentage of Students Receiving Extra
Help in Reading By Amount of Time and Skill Mastery Level

Skill Level	Days Per Week				
	1	2	3	4	5
Mastery	87.3	82.9	80.3	77.8	73.8
Non-Mastery	44.5	39.6	35.2	30.0	28.0

Further, those students with high-risk characteristics such as absenteeism, a low level of interest in reading, and repetition of the current grade, were examined to determine their mastery level in reading as well as the amount and type of tutorial services they had received. It was found that 90% of the students at each grade level had missed fewer than 20 days of school. However, for the students who had missed more than 20 school days, only 4.1% showed a mastery level in reading. This finding is further evidence of the relationship between school attendance and achievement.

With regard to interest level, it was found that most of the students were perceived to be interested in reading; 16% of the students were reported to be "very interested" in reading and 75% were reported to be "somewhat interested". It was also found that 91.9% of those students who had mastered reading were perceived by their teachers to be interested in reading, just as 87.1% of those students who had not mastered the reading objectives were perceived to have an interest in reading. It, therefore, appears most students were perceived to have an interest in reading, but very few (only 4.6%) of those students not showing an interest in reading received extra help through the tutorial services.

Also, while only 9% of all students were repeating their current grade, one-half of these students were still showing a non-mastery level in reading. Forty percent of these students had received help from the reading specialist and 35% had received help from the teacher aide. The other tutorial sources were used by less than 10% of these students.

Math:

As earlier shown in Table 10a, 26.5% of these students received extra help from math specialists or resource teachers and 22.3% received help from the teacher aides. It was again found, however, that only a few students had received help in math through each of the tutorial support services.

Further, while 75.1% of those students showing mastery in math had received extra help 5 days a week, only 22.9% of those showing non-mastery levels had received help this frequently (see Table 10C). Again it appears that, when rendered frequently, tutorial services are related to skill mastery.

TABLE 10c.
Percentage of Students Receiving Extra
Help in Math By Amount of Time and Skill Mastery Level

Skill Level	Days Per Week				
	1	2	3	4	5
Mastery	88.1	84.7	81.4	78.7	75.1
Non-Mastery	51.2	49.7	44.3	31.4	22.9

Those students with high-risk characteristics such as absenteeism, low interest in math, and who were repeating their current grade were also examined for mastery levels in math. While, as stated, 90% of all students were found to have missed fewer than 20 days of school, only 4.2% of those students who had missed more than 20 school days showed a mastery level in math.

It was also reported that 15% of the students were "very interested" in math, and 75% were "somewhat interested". The majority of those students showing a mastery level in math (92%) were perceived by their teachers to be interested in math, just as a large percentage (86.9%) of those not showing a mastery level were also perceived to be interested. However, very few (5.4%) of those not interested were reported to have received extra help.

For those students repeating their current grade (9%), more than half (55%) still did not show a mastery level of math. Thirty-seven percent of these students received extra help from the math specialist and 34% received help from the teacher aide. The most frequently used tutorial source was the peer-tutor, which was used by 13% of these students.

Chapter 1 Program in Reading and Mathematics

CBC provides that students attending Chapter 1 schools receive extra remedial services in the basic skills of reading and math, and are, therefore, prepared to meet the SPP criteria for promotion.

Reading:

Eighty-one percent of the students receiving Chapter 1 services in reading showed a mastery level in reading. Also, the majority of the Chapter 1 students were reported to have used the reading material on the "approved textbook list". The most frequently used were MacMillian (21.9%) and Lippincott (15.4%).

Of those students receiving Chapter 1 services in reading, 98% received extra help from either a reading specialist or a teacher aide. Also, 50% were reported to have received extra help 4 or 5 days a week.

Math:

Eighty-three percent of the students receiving Chapter 1 services in math showed a skills mastery level in math. The most frequently used math textbook was MacMillian (21%), followed by Harcourt Brace and Jovanovich (10%) and Houghton Mifflin (9%).

Ninety-eight percent of the Chapter 1 math students were reported to receive extra help from either a math specialist or math teacher aide and 48% received extra help 4 or 5 days a week.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF SPP

Strengths of SPP

SPP has demonstrated several measures of strength: (1) by setting criteria that students be promoted based on their reading and math abilities, SPP assures basic skill mastery; (2) by requiring that specific objectives be achieved before promotion, SPP thereby supports the elimination of "social promotions"; (3) by assessing skill mastery and determining promotion eligibility on a semester basis rather than once a year, SPP assures that deficiencies in reading and math will be identified early for remediation; and (4) by assessing students based on specific instructional objectives, areas of weakness are more clearly identified. Also, since the implementation of SPP, the rate of student promotion has steadily increased, and thereby indicates that the major strength of SPP lies in its ability to facilitate steady progress among students. However, the strengths of SPP are most noted when favorable comparisons are found between the DCPS rates of promotion and those for the surrounding county school jurisdictions (see Appendix B, Table K).

Weaknesses of SPP

One major weakness of SPP lies within the very foundation of the plan. Skill attainment, mastery and promotion eligibility is determined by the student's ability to meet specific instructional objectives. The classroom teacher has the sole responsibility of determining whether such objectives have been met based on the student's performance throughout the semester. This process appears to be reliable up to a point -- the point being sixth grade students seeking promotions to the junior high school level.

The question of reliability is raised upon examination of those students who are promoted with deficiencies. As shown earlier, the number of students promoted with deficiencies steadily increases with grade level up to the sixth grade. At the sixth grade level the percentage of students reported to be in transition with deficiencies is greatly reduced. What accounts for this substantial decline in promotions with deficiencies? Since the amount of remedial services provided to the sixth graders was not greater than that provided to the other grade level, is it realistic to assume that the decline in deficiencies is the result of classroom instructions only? Or, is it more realistic to assume that sixth graders seeking promotions out of the elementary schools are, perhaps, assessed more leniently than the younger students?

This is a critical issue of concern, particularly since many receiving junior high schools have reported that new seventh grade students appear to be falling short in meeting their new objectives. They appear to lack the prerequisite skills necessary to meet these objectives. A recent report issued on seventh grade achievement results indicated that 63% of the seventh graders had CTBS (total battery) scores below the norm (DCPS 1985). This report also indicated that a number of schools had promotion rates above 90% although their sixth grade CTBS scores were below the national norm in both reading and math.

One major weakness of SPP lies in the implementation of such a plan without an adequate support system. SPP identifies remedial needs, but lacks the mandative authority to assure that remediation is provided. Based on the number of students with deficiencies who received tutorial services, the tutorial program is inadequate. SPP is effective to the extent that deficiencies are remediated. Based on the increasing number of deficiencies by grade level, deficiencies appear to be carried forth rather than eradicated.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, it is concluded that SPP is an effective delivery system for CBC. It continuously monitors and identifies deficient students and areas of weakness. SPP is very efficient in determining where remedial resources are needed, as well as assessing the impact of these resources on student progress. The problem, however, is that few remedial resources are utilized. Also, since it is necessary for students to meet instructional objectives for promotion, "social promotions" are less apt to occur. Those students attaining promotion are most likely to have obtained the skills necessary to meet their new curriculum objectives, and this virtually assures continuous progress. However, since skill mastery and promotion is determined solely by the classroom teacher's assessment of the student, there still remains the possibility of undeserved or "social promotions"; particularly at the sixth grade level when the student is seeking promotion out of the school.

In view of these conclusions, two program changes are recommended for consideration. Firstly, mandative authority should be placed with SPP for remediation. If a student is determined to be failing the instructional objectives, tutorial services should be required. This is, of course, provided that a new and improved tutorial program be fully implemented.

Secondly, it is recommended that the promotion process for the sixth grade students be reviewed for the purpose of requiring additional documentation of skill mastery in reading and math. Perhaps such documentation would be in the form of a competency test to determine academic eligibility for junior high school entry. It is speculated that such a policy would significantly improve the negative academic experiences of the new junior high entrants which has customarily been attributed to "social maladjustments".

REFERENCES

District of Columbia Public Schools, Division of Quality Assurance. (October, 1981). The Student Progress Plan (SPP) Implementation: Grades One-Three. Washington, D.C.

District of Columbia Public Schools, Division of Quality Assurance. (June, 1984). Reading Textbooks and Student Progress: A Study of Reading Material used for Instruction in Grades One-Six. Washington, D.C.

District of Columbia Public Schools, Division of Quality Assurance. (June, 1985). Student Progress Plan (SPP) Grades One-Six and Secondary School Progress Plan (SSPP) Grade Seven Promotion Results. Washington, D.C.

Appendix A
(Forms)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS • DIVISION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE
THE EVALUATION SYSTEM READING AND MATHEMATICS PROGRAM DATA COLLECTION FORM #300

TEACHER'S NAME Print Last Name–skip one space–print as much of First Name as possible

SCHOOL CODE

CLASS CODE

Print and fill in the circles to indicate the number of students for whom you have submitted a form in your class package.

____ 19 ____
(DATE)

COMPLETED FORMS

TO THE HOMEROOM OR FAMILY TEACHER: See back of form for instructions. Read and follow instructions carefully.

1. Are your students involved in some reading and/or math activity at least once everyday? (Mark one for each subject)

READING		MATHEMATICS
○	YES	○
○	NO	○

2. Indicate the number of students in your class who have learning problems in any of the following areas: (Mark all that apply)

	NONE	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 OR MORE
READING	○	○	○	○	○
MATHEMATICS	○	○	○	○	○
LANGUAGE ARTS	○	○	○	○	○
SCIENCE	○	○	○	○	○
OTHER	○	○	○	○	○

3. Indicate the number of students in your class who have learning barriers in any of the following categories: (Mark all that apply)

	NONE	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 OR MORE
ATTENDANCE	○	○	○	○	○
WITHDRAWN BEHAVIOR	○	○	○	○	○
DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR	○	○	○	○	○
NUTRITION	○	○	○	○	○
DRUGS	○	○	○	○	○
CHILD ABUSE	○	○	○	○	○
ECONOMIC CONDITIONS (clothing, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○
MEDICAL/PHYSICAL HEALTH (vision, hearing, pregnancy, injury, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○

4. How many of your students have been referred because of: (Mark one for each category)

LEARNING PROBLEMS		LEARNING BARRIERS
○	NONE	○
○	1-5	○
○	6-10	○
○	11-20	○
○	OVER 20	○

5. To which of the following have your students been referred? (Mark all that apply)

PRINCIPAL OR ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL	○
COUNSELOR	○
HEALTH SPECIALIST (NURSE)	○
SPEECH THERAPIST	○
PUPIL PERSONNEL WORKER/ATTENDANCE OFFICER	○
VISITING INSTRUCTOR	○
SPECIAL TEACHER(S) (READING, MATH, SCHOOL-BASED, ETC.)	○
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST	○
SOCIAL WORKER	○
AIDES (EDUC., CHAPTER 1, HEALTH, COMMUN., ETC.)	○
TUTORS	○
NONE	○
OTHER	○
SPECIFY:	

6. Which of the following CBC/SPP aids or instructional components do you use regularly? (Mark all that apply for each subject)

READING		MATHEMATICS
○	OBJECTIVES	○
○	INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES	○
○	ASSESSMENT TASKS	○
○	CHECKLISTS	○
○	GUIDES/MANUALS	○
○	PROGRESS SHEETS/CHARTS	○
○	LEARNING STATIONS	○
○	SURVEY/CLUSTER TESTS	○

7. Indicate the order in which you usually apply any or all of the following techniques when developing a math lesson with your students. (Mark all that apply)

USE OF ABSTRACT MATERIALS/BLACKBOARD	① ② ③ ④
USE OF PICTORIAL MATERIALS/BLACKBOARD	① ② ③ ④
USE OF MANIPULATIVE MATERIALS	① ② ③ ④
LECTURE/EXPLAINING	① ② ③ ④

NCS Trans-Optic® 8816-12833-321

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS • DIVISION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE
THE EVALUATION SYSTEM READING AND MATHEMATICS PROGRAM DATA COLLECTION FORM #301

STUDENT'S NAME — Print Last Name—skip one space—print as much of First Name as possible

STUDENT ID NUMBER

SCHOOL CODE

CLASS CODE

INSTRUCTIONS

- MAKE HEAVY BLACK MARKS THAT COMPLETELY FILL THE CIRCLE.
- ERASE CLEANLY ANY ANSWERS YOU WISH TO CHANGE.
- MAKE NO STRAY MARKINGS OF ANY KIND.

CORRECT MARK ● INCORRECT MARKS ⊗ ◔ ◒ ⊖

1. Indicate the sex of this student:
   ○ MALE ○ FEMALE

2. Did this student receive Chapter 1 services during the current semester? (Mark one for each subject)

Reading		Mathematics
○	YES	○
○	NO	○

3. Is this student an identified special education student?
   ○ YES ○ NO

   If yes, complete a and b.
   a. Does this student participate in reading to the same extent as regular students?
   ○ YES ○ NO

   b. Does this student participate in mathematics to the same extent as regular students?
   ○ YES ○ NO

   If the response to 3a and/or 3b is "NO" then omit items 4 and 5.

4. Indicate the student's current grade placement and instructional levels for the beginning and end of current semester.

	CURRENT GRADE	Reading Instructional Level	Mathematics Instructional Level
BEGINNING OF CURRENT SEMESTER	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ / Ⓐ Ⓑ Ⓣ	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ / Ⓐ Ⓑ	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ / Ⓐ Ⓑ
END OF CURRENT SEMESTER		① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ / Ⓐ Ⓑ	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ / Ⓐ Ⓑ

Indicate the mastery (+) or non-mastery (–) of the student's instruction levels for the end of the current semester.

MASTERY	Reading	Mathematics
	⊕ ⊖	⊕ ⊖

5. Indicate the student's next semester grade placement and instruction levels.

	NEXT SEMESTER GRADE	Reading Instructional Level	Mathematics Instructional Level
NEXT SEMESTER	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ / Ⓐ Ⓑ Ⓣ	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ / Ⓐ Ⓑ	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ / Ⓐ Ⓑ

6. Print and fill in the circle to indicate the number of days this student was absent during the current semester.

ABSENCES

7. If this student will be entering another school next semester as a result of normal progression (to a middle school or to a junior high school) print and fill in the circle to indicate the school code of the receiving school. Write the school name here.

RECEIVING SCHOOL CODE

SCHOOL NAME

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

NCS Trans-Optic EP18-22389-331 A1304

40

43

8. (For Chapter I schools only)
Considering the needs of the students in your classroom, which priority would you assign to this student for reading and mathematics instructional services offered through the Chapter I program?
(Mark only one for each subject)

READING		MATHEMATICS
O	NO SPECIAL NEED	O
O	LOW DEGREE OF NEED	O
O	MODERATE DEGREE OF NEED	O
O	HIGH DEGREE OF NEED	O

9. As this student's family or homeroom teacher, are you also his/her regular teacher of the following subjects?
(Mark one for each subject)

READING		MATHEMATICS
O	YES	O
O	NO	O

10. What is your assessment of this student's interest in:
(Mark one for each subject)

READING		MATHEMATICS
O	VERY INTERESTED	O
O	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED	O
O	NOT INTERESTED	O

11a. Indicate for this student the current most frequently used reading and mathematics materials by gridding the proper codes below. A list of the materials and codes has been provided.

READING

0	0	0
1	1	1
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
5	5	5
6	6	6
7	7	7
8	8	8
9	9	9

MATHEMATICS

A	0	0
B	1	1
C	2	2
D	3	3
E	4	4
F	5	5
G	6	6
H	7	7
	8	8
	9	9

11b. To what extent are these materials indicative of what was used all year for this student?
(Mark one for each subject)

READING		MATHEMATICS
O	VERY SIMILAR	O
O	SOMEWHAT SIMILAR	O
O	NOT SIMILAR	O
O	DON'T KNOW	O

12. From which of the following sources other than the regular reading and mathematics teacher has this student received extra help?
(Mark all that apply for each subject)

READING		MATHEMATICS
	a. During the regular school day	
O	SPECIALIST/RESOURCE TEACHER	O
O	TEACHER AIDE	O
O	PEER TUTOR	O
O	JR/SR HIGH TUTOR	O
O	COLLEGE TUTOR	O
O	PARENT/COMMUNITY TUTOR	O
O	OPERATION RESCUE	O
O	OTHER	O
	b. After school	
O	OPERATION RESCUE	O
O	STARS (Chapter 1)	O
O	OTHER	O

13. How often each week does this student usually receive extra help?
(Mark one for each subject)

READING		MATHEMATICS
O	NONE	O
O	1 DAY	O
O	2 DAYS	O
O	3 DAYS	O
O	4 DAYS	O
O	5 DAYS	O

14. Is this student repeating the current grade?

O YES NO O

15. Has this student repeated a prior grade?

O YES NO O

16. To your knowledge is this student's background of experiences adequate to enable him/her to function successfully in your classroom?

O YES NO O

17. Including this month, how many months has this student been in your homeroom or family class this year?
(Mark only one)

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)

MAKE NO STRAY MARKS ON THIS FORM

Appendix B
(Tables)

Table A

Region A
SPP Promotions by School
(Second Semester)

Region	School	Grade Levels	Number Reported	Percent Promoted
A	Amidon	1-6	341	94.13
	Birney	1-6	330	90.91
	Bowen	1-6	238	90.34
	Draper	1-6	466	96.57
	Friendship	1-6	451	89.58
	Garfield	1-6	379	84.96
	Garrison	1-6	276	95.29
	Green	1-6	580	87.59
	Hendley	1-6	488	88.52
	King, M.L.	1-6	413	91.28
	Leckie	1-6	433	94.69
	Malcolm X	1-6	495	88.89
	McGogney	1-6	430	92.56
	Montgomery	1-6	409	92.42
	Moten	4-6	346	97.98
	Nichols	1-3	116	93.97
	Patterson	1-6	361	95.29
	Ross	1-6	106	92.45
	Seaton	1-6	286	87.41
	Savoy	1-6	284	92.25
	Simon	1-6	416	94.95
	Stevens	1-6	257	92.22
	Syphax	1-6	199	92.46
	Terrell	1-6	448	94.64
	Thomson	1-6	252	93.25
	Turner	1-6	481	89.81
	Van Ness	1-6	215	91.63
	Walker-Jones	1-6	443	89.39
	Washington Highland	1-6	459	92.16
	Wilkinson	1-3	434	87.10
	Wilson	1-6	360	97.50
Total Students Reported			11,192	

Table B

Region B
SPP Promotions by School
(Second Semester)

Region	School	Grade Levels	Number Reported	Percent Promoted
B	Barnard	1-6	250	89.20
	Brightwood	1-6	389	91.26
	Clark	1-6	182	90.11
	Eaton	1-6	271	97.05
	Hardy	5-6	65	100.00
	Hearst	1-6	142	98.59
	Hyde	1-5	98	96.94
	Janney	1-6	162	95.06
	Keene	1-6	236	91.10
	Key	1-5	99	97.98
	Lafayette	1-6	306	97.71
	LaSalle	1-6	279	96.42
	Mann	1-6	138	99.28
	Murch	1-6	237	99.58
	Oyster	1-6	236	97.46
	Petworth	1-6	175	95.43
	Powell	1-6	178	91.57
	Raymond	1-6	408	92.40
	Rudolph	1-6	350	97.71
	Shepherd	1-6	301	98.01
	Stoddert	1-4	97	98.97
	Takoma	1-6	325	94.15
	Truesdell	1-6	281	95.37
	West	1-6	299	97.66
	Whittier	1-6	271	97.79
Total Students Reported			5,775	

Table C

Region C
SPP Promotions by School
(Second Semester)

Region	School	Grade Levels	Number Reported	Percent Promoted
C	Adams	1-6	217	95.39
	Bancroft	1-6	472	90.68
	Brookland	1-6	275	86.91
	Bruce-Monroe	1-6	332	90.66
	Bunker Hill	1-6	334	94.91
	Burroughs	1-6	280	95.00
	Cleveland	1-6	162	89.51
	Cook	1-3	144	95.14
	Cooke	1-6	322	92.55
	Emery	1-6	356	94.38
	Fort Lincoln	1-6	224	86.61
	Gage-Eckington	1-6	251	98.01
	Harrison	1-6	164	84.76
	Langdon	1-6	275	89.09
	Lewis	1-6	256	94.14
	Meyer	1-6	457	94.00
	Noyes	1-6	308	86.69
	Park View	1-6	381	88.45
	Reed	1-6	234	92.31
	Shaed	1-6	328	88.72
	Slater-Langston	4-6	119	96.64
	Slowe	1-6	225	91.56
	Tubman	1-6	389	87.15
	Webb	1-6	493	95.13
	Wheatley	1-6	406	93.10
	Woodridge	1-6	87	96.55
	Young	1-6	374	88.50
Total Students Reported			7,865	

Table D

Region D
SPP Promotions by School
(Second Semester)

Region	School	Grade Levels	Number Reported	Percent Promoted
D	Aiton	1-6	241	92.12
	Beers	1-6	401	99.75
	Benning	1-6	251	87.65
	Blow	1-6	330	95.15
	Brent	1-6	207	96.62
	Bryan	1-6	165	95.76
	Burrville	1-6	242	95.89
	Carver	1-6	89	92.13
	Davis	1-6	346	92.20
	Drew	1-6	317	97.79
	Fletcher-Johnson	1-6	387	89.92
	Gibbs	1-6	240	90.42
	Giddings	1-6	130	96.92
	Goding	1-6	203	95.07
	Harris	1-6	293	93.52
	Hobson	4-6	124	100.00
	Houston	1-6	229	96.07
	Kenilworth	1-6	234	90.60
	Ketcham	1-6	528	96.59
	Kimball	1-6	473	94.29
	Kingsman	1-6	235	95.32
	Ludlow-Taylor	1-6	310	96.77
	Maury	1-6	136	92.65
	Merritt	1-6	187	85.03
	Miner	1-6	235	94.04
	Nalle	1-6	338	92.90
	Orr	1-6	449	92.65
	Payne	1-6	131	93.13
	Peabody	1-3	170	93.53
	Plummer	1-6	214	87.38
	Randle-Highlands	1-6	354	90.68
	Richardson	1-6	232	94.82
	River Terrace	1-6	208	95.67
	Shadd	1-6	437	91.30
	Smothers	1-6	215	90.70
	Stanton	1-6	369	88.89
	Thomas	1-6	239	95.40
	Tyler	1-6	243	86.83
	Watkins	1-6	253	96.44
	Weatherless	1-6	226	89.82
	Winston	1-6	329	93.31
Total Students Reported			10,940	

Table E

SPP Promotions for School Years by Region
(Second Semester)

School Year	Region A	Region B	Region C	Region D
1982-83	90.7	95.0	89.9	91.5
1983-84	92.8	95.5	91.2	93.2
1984-85	93.0	95.4	92.3	93.1
1985-86	91.7	95.4	91.5	93.3

Table F
Percentage of Students Receiving
Extra Help in Reading and Math
by Grade Level

	Grade Level					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Reading:						
Specialist	16.6	21.2	27.2	30.7	32.3	27.8
Teacher Aide	38.6	33.5	32.1	9.1	8.3	6.3
Peer Tutor	7.5	8.0	9.0	6.8	9.1	6.2
Jr/Sr High Tutor	1.0	1.2	0.5	0.6	1.1	0.2
College Tutor	0.4	0.4	0.3	1.4	1.3	0.8
Parent/Community Tutor	8.0	7.0	7.5	3.2	4.4	0.9
Operation Rescue	0.4	0.8	1.5	0.2	0.2	0.4
Other	2.5	2.0	1.8	3.0	3.4	4.5
Operation Rescue After School	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.4
STARS(Community)	1.7	5.4	4.5	5.4	5.5	5.8
Other After School	3.0	5.0	5.3	3.6	5.3	4.5
Math:						
Specialist	15.6	20.2	28.3	33.9	33.0	31.1
Teacher Aide	37.5	33.0	32.7	9.7	8.4	5.3
Peer Tutor	7.7	7.7	10.8	7.7	11.6	7.5
Jr/Sr High Tutor	1.1	1.2	0.7	0.7	1.5	0.3
College Tutor	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.2	1.4	0.8
Parent/Community	7.4	6.2	7.5	3.6	3.7	1.3
Operation Rescue	0.3	0.7	1.4	0.7	0.7	0.9
Other	2.2	1.6	1.2	2.9	3.4	4.1
Operation Rescue After School	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.6
STAR (Chapter 1)	1.6	4.8	4.5	5.8	5.4	5.9
Other After After School	3.0	4.2	5.3	5.1	6.2	4.8

Table G

Region A
SPP Promotions for Chapter 1 Schools
(Second Semester)

Region	School	Grade Levels	Number Reported	Percent Promoted
A	Birney	1-6	222	88.74
	Bowen	1-6	166	87.95
	Draper	1-6	174	91.95
	Friendship	1-6	117	90.60
	Garfield	1-6	244	80.74
	Garrison	1-6	148	93.24
	Green	1-5	78	80.77
	Hendley	1-6	250	82.00
	King, M.L.	1-6	103	90.29
	Malcolm X	1-6	127	84.25
	Montgomery	1-6	123	90.24
	Moten	1-3	96	97.92
	Patterson	1-6	170	93.53
	Savoy	1-6	79	88.61
	Seaton	1-6	147	82.31
	Simon	1-6	257	94.16
	Syphax	1-5	67	97.01
	Terrell	1-6	244	93.03
	Thomson	1-6	71	88.73
	Turner	1-6	225	85.33
	Van Ness	1-6	203	91.13
	Walker-Jones	1-5	129	90.70
	Washington-Highland	1-6	153	84.97
	Wilkinson	1-3	172	83.14
	Wilson	1-6	183	98.36
Total Students Reported			3869	

Table H

Region B
SPP Promotions for Chapter 1 School
(Second Semester)

Region	School	Grade Levels	Number Reported	Percent Promoted
B	Powell	1-6	60	88.33
	Raymond	1-6	214	89.72
	Truesdell	1-6	134	96.27
Total Students Reported			408	

Table I

Region C
SPP Promotions for Chapter 1 School
(Second Semester)

Region	School	Grade Levels	Number Reported	Percent Promoted
C	Bancroft	1-6	120	84.17
	Bruce-Monroe	1-6	178	89.33
	Cleveland	1-5	76	90.79
	Cook	1-3	88	93.18
	Cooke	1-6	213	92.49
	Emery	1-5	133	88.72
	Gage-Eckington	1-6	80	96.25
	Harrison	1-6	76	77.63
	Langdon	1-6	142	85.21
	Lewis	1-6	121	92.56
	Meyer	1-6	170	92.35
	Park View	1-6	167	84.43
	Reed	1-6	170	92.94
	Slater	1-3	52	100.00
	Slowe	1-6	117	88.89
	Tubman	1-6	186	83.87
	Webb	1-6	208	90.38
	Wheatley	1-6	130	88.46
	Young	1-6	210	82.38
Total Students Reported			2637	

Table J

Region D
SPP Promotions for Chapter 1 School
(Second Semester)

Region	School	Grade Levels	Number Reported	Percent Promoted
D	Alton	1-6	103	93.20
	Blow	1-6	93	93.55
	Carver	1-6	41	85.37
	Davis	1-6	154	84.42
	Drew	1-6	153	97.39
	Fletcher-Johnson	1-6	267	87.80
	Gibbs	1-6	80	83.75
	Giddings	1-6	71	98.59
	Harris	1-6	147	90.48
	Houston	1-6	183	96.72
	Kenilworth	1-6	127	88.19
	Ketcham	1-6	177	96.05
	Kimball	1-6	73	87.67
	Ludlow-Taylor	1-6	125	93.60
	Miner	1-6	121	93.39
	Nalle	1-6	222	89.64
	Payne	1-6	54	90.74
	Plummer	1-6	103	79.61
	Richardson	1-6	132	92.42
	Shadd	1-6	163	88.96
	Stanton	1-6	188	81.91
	Thomas	1-6	89	95.51
	Tyler	1-6	211	86.26
	Weatherless	1-6	181	87.85
	Winston	1-6	123	88.76
Total Students Reported			3381	

Table K

Comparison of Promotion Rates
For DCPS and Surrounding
County School Districts

Grade Level	D.C.	Montgomery County	Prince George's County	Fairfax County	Arlington County
1	85.5	94.3	92.1	93.2	91.2
2	90.2	98.1	96.5	97.5	95.9
3	91.6	99.0	97.8	98.5	98.4
4	93.1	99.4	98.5	98.8	97.1
5	94.0	99.5	98.9	99.1	98.0
6	95.6	99.5	99.7	99.6	99.5
1-6	91.6	98.3	97.2	97.7	96.7